

Appln. No. 10/737,033

Amendment dated September 19, 2007

Reply to Office Action of March 19, 2007

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1, 2 and 4. The first replacement sheet replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1 and 2 and the second replacement sheet replaces the original sheet including Fig. 4.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (2)

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated March 19, 2007, claims 1-29 were examined with the result that claims 8-17 and 19-28 were allowed, claims 1, 18 and 29 were rejected and claims 2-7 were objected to by the Examiner. The rejections made by the Examiner were non-final. In response, applicant has canceled claim 2 and amended claims 1, 18 and 29. In view of the above amendments and following remarks reconsideration of this application is requested.

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to by the Examiner. The Examiner indicated that the plastic material of the container must be properly reflected with crosshatching in the sectional views of Figures 1, 2 and 4. Accordingly, applicant submits corrected drawing sheets, each of which are labeled "Replacement Sheet" in accordance with the Rules. In Figures 1, 2 and 4, the plastic material of the container is now properly crosshatched in the sectional views.

The Examiner also objected to the drawings as not properly illustrating the "convex inner surface" claimed in claims 18 and 29. The Examiner indicated that this convex inner surface must be shown or the features canceled from the claims. In response, applicant notes that the "convex" inner surface was meant to be described with respect to the longitudinal axis 2 of the container shown in Figures 1 and 2 and with respect to the longitudinal axis 6 of the container shown in Figure 4. Thus, the inner surface was described as being "convex" with respect to that axis. In other words, applicant believed both the inner surface and the outer surface were both "convex" with respect to the longitudinal axis 2 and/or 6 shown in the drawings. However, in order to clarify this matter, claims 18 and 29 have been amended to eliminate the term "convex" therefrom. Thus, claims 18 and 29 now merely call for an outer surface and an inner surface which converge toward each other. As a result of these amendments to claims 18 and 29, Figures 1, 2 and 4 have not been further amended or corrected in this regard.

In summary, Figures 1, 2 and 4 have merely been amended to incorporate the proper cross hatching to show the plastic material of the container in the sectional views thereof.

Appln. No. 10/737,033

Amendment dated September 19, 2007

Reply to Office Action of March 19, 2007

In the Office Action, claims 18 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner objected to the term "convex" used in the claim. However, as noted above, applicant has amended claims 18 and 29 to correct this deficiency. Thus, applicant believes the Examiner should withdraw the § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 18 and 29.

In the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Werding '577 in view of Krishnakumar et al '829. However, claims 2-7 were merely objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, i.e. claim 1. The Examiner indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of claim 2 therein. This obviously necessitated the cancellation of claim 2. Thus, applicant believes claims 1 and 3-7 are now allowable.


In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 8-17 and 19-28 were allowable.

In summary, applicant believes claims 1 and 3-29 are all now allowable.

An effort has been made to place this application into condition for allowance and such action has been earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP


Thomas M. Wozny
Reg. No. 28,922

Andrus, Sceales, Starke & Sawall, LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
Telephone: (414) 271-7590
Facsimile: (414) 271-5770